



3 1735 060 350 125

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2009 with funding from  
University of Pittsburgh Library System

SPEECH  
OF THE  
HON. EDSON B. OLDS,

AT A MEETING HELD IN  
THE DEMOCRATIC HALL, AT CIRCLEVILLE, OHIO,

ON  
THE 9th OF FEBRUARY, 1856.

*Mr. President and Fellow-Citizens:*

Although not a single year has passed within the last eighteen, without my having been called upon to address the Democracy of this city, still I should feel that I was derelict in duty, did I not respond to the call that you have now made upon me.

I am truly gratified to see you thus early perfecting your organization, and rallying your forces for the great battle of 1856. I repeat the words "the great battle of 1856." For in my humble judgment, there never has been a period in the history of our country since the days of the Revolution, so fraught with danger to our Government, and our free institutions as the present. Whether that glorious Union, under which we have grown to greatness and power shall continue—and that Constitution, formed by the wisdom, the patriotism, and the self-sacrificing spirit of our Revolutionary fathers, that Constitution which should be as sacred to the people of the United States, as was the "Ark of the Covenant" to the children of Israel, shall remain as the palladium of our liberty, binding us together as one people, or whether it shall become as a rope of sand, will be determined by the canvass of 1856.

The signs of the times all point with unerring truthfulness to the fact, that the Constitution and the Union are now entrusted to the keeping of the Democracy of the United States.

I see, those around me to-night, who for more than half a century, have stood as sentinels upon the watch-towers of Democracy. Whilst then, for the benefit of the young men who are my auditors on this occasion, I trace the past history of the Democratic party, these gray-haired fathers will bear testimony to the truthfulness of what I have to say.

They will tell you that the Democratic party has always been a National party. Its principles are now and always have been National in their character. It has always stood by the Constitution and the Union: at the hustings and in Legislative Halls, it has always contended for measures for the weal of the whole country: by land and by sea it has always been found battling for, and bearing aloft the stars and stripes of our country, inscribed with our national motto, "E Pluribus Unum."

This old time-honored party, for more than half a century has been identified with the best interests of our country. It has been assailed by foes without, and betrayed by foes within; its principles have been misrepresented and ridiculed; its standard-bearers have been vilified and traduced, yet its history is interwoven with all that is great and good in the history of our country.

I ask these gray-haired fathers, to what party are we indebted for those measures of policy which have enlarged the borders of our country? With one accord they answer the Democratic party.

Yes, Mr. President, when we acquired the Louisiana Territory, out of which have been formed the States of Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, and Iowa, and the Territories of Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, Kansas, and Nebraska, the Democratic party, under the lead of Thos. Jefferson, were in power. The old Federal party denounced and opposed the measure; but Democracy triumphed, and the Valley of the Mississippi, and the "Father of waters," is ours.

When we acquired Florida, the Democratic party, under the lead of Mr. Monroe, were the dominant party in the country; and now, thanks to that party, no Spanish Dominion lies between us and the gulf of Mexico.

When we annexed the Republic of Texas to the American Union, the Democratic party were in power. The measure was opposed with great bitterness by the opposition party; but the unterrified, true to their political principles, held on until the "lone star" shone beautiful and bright, as one of the American constellations.

When we acquired California, Utah, and New Mexico, the Democracy, under the lead of James K. Polk, were in power. Our opponents denounced the measure, and denounced the country—some of you may remember hearing my competitor, in the canvass of 1848, say, that he "would not curse his worst enemy by giving him a thousand acres in California," but the Democracy claiming "indemnity for the past, and security for the future," held on amid the cannon's roar upon the battle-fields of Mexico, and opposition denunciations in the Halls of Congress, until California, Utah, and New Mexico, with their countless treasures, became ours.

But, I stop not here. To the Democracy are we indebted for that respect which we maintain among the Nations of the Earth. The war of 1812 was denounced by our opponents as a Democratic war! as James Madison's war! There were those during its prosecution who could meet in Hartford Convention to plot the dissolution of the Union—there were those who could burn blue lights along the shores of Connecticut to light the enemies vessels into our harbors—there were those who could declare in the Senate of the United States, that "they would not vote a dollar to prosecute that war, though the enemies cannon were battering down the walls of the American Capital." But thank God none of these men belonged to the Democratic party. Our battle-cry was then "free trade and sailor's rights," and through blood and treasure, the Democracy maintained our national honor, until we compelled our haughty foes to respect our rights, and by our valor by land and by sea, we challenged and received the admiration of the world.

Again, Mr. President, the war with Mexico was denounced by our political opponents as a "Democratic war," as "James K. Polk's war." There were those who could declare, that "were they Mexicans, they would welcome our soldiers with bloody hands to hospitable graves." But again, thank God, such men were not of the Democratic party. The battle-fields of Mexico can bear ample testimony, that under Democratic rule, there were brave hearts and stalwart arms that could battle valiantly, until we had obtained indemnity for the past, and security for the future.

To the Democratic party, also, are we indebted for those measures of Nation-

al policy, which have made us the most prosperous people upon the face of the Globe.

You may search your national statute books, and the history of parties in the country, but you will look in vain if you expect to find a single measure of national policy, opposed by the Democracy, but advocated and put into operation by the opposition, which has not been signally condemned by the American people.

A Bank of the United States was once the pride and boast of the opposition. But under the lead of Andrew Jackson, it fell beneath the war blast of the Democracy, "and now lies it there and none so poor as to do it reverence."

The opposition once considered and advocated banks as the only safe depositories of the public monies. In the removal of the Government deposits, they predicted, that "our Canals would become a solitude, and our Lakes a desert waste of waters." But amid the denunciations and loud clamors of ruin from the opposition, the Democracy removed the deposits, declared an eternal divorce of Bank and State, and established the Independent Treasury. And now, after ten years experience, in both peace and war, he would be a bold man who dared advocate the repeal of the Independent Treasury, and the restoration of the Government deposits to the banks of the country.

The opposition were once the peculiar friends of a high protective tariff. It was inscribed upon their banners—engrafted into their creeds, and incorporated into their platforms. But the Democracy denounced the policy as unequal and unjust—as oppressive to the poor, and protective only to the rich. The warfare was long and bitter. The substitution of a tariff for revenue was denounced by the opposition as ruinous in the extreme to the country. The Democracy however triumphed. The high protective tariff was repealed, and a tariff for revenue substituted. For ten years this Democratic measure has been in operation. During that time we have prosecuted a foreign war to a successful and glorious termination, and still we have an overflowing treasury. During that time the prosperity of the whole country has been unequalled in the past history of the world.

But I trespass upon your time, and weary your patience by particularizing any further the peculiar and distinctive measures of policy of the opposition. The repeal of the Bankrupt Law, and the law distributing the proceeds of the sale of the public lands among the several States, wiped from your national statute books the last vestige of opposition policy. Democratic measures have become the fixed and settled policy of the country.

Am I claiming then too much, Mr. President, when I say that it is the Democracy who have unrolled the map of Empire, until the American Union extends from the waters of the gulf of St. Lawrence to the gulf of Mexico, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific oceans.

Am I claiming too much, when I say that it is the Democratic party who have maintained your national honor during the prosecution of every war since the days of the Revolution; and that to the Democracy we are indebted for the high position we have taken among the nations of the earth?

Again, I ask, am I claiming too much when, after searching the past records of the country, I say that to the Democratic party we are indebted for those measures of internal policy, which have made us, not only the most prosperous people upon the face of the globe, but the envy and admiration of the whole world!

Such, Mr. President, in a few words, has been the past history of the Democratic party. For more than half a century, with the exception of two periods of four years each, it has been in the ascendency. Its policy has been, and still is identified with the best interests of the country. Its course has ever been

progressive and onward. It has triumphed over all opposition, no matter by what name that opposition may have been denominated; and to day it stands before the American people, endeared by the recollection of the past, and bearing the hopes of the future. Well may it be the pride and boast of any man to say, I AM A DEMOCRAT.

We are now, Mr. President, about to unfurl the democratic banner, and marshal the Democratic forces for the canvass of 1856. The great battle will be fought upon the first Monday in November next. The Democratic army will march to the battle-field under a leader to be selected in National Convention. He will bear upon his shoulders our "Ark of the Covenant" containing the "Constitution and the Union;" and over that army, in the bright sunlight of Heaven, will wave the old time-honored Democratic banner inscribed in bright and shining letters, the words, "The Union and the Constitution, one and indivisible." Against you will be marshaled the combined forces of all the "isms" of the day. The right wing of the opposition army will be composed mostly of the "Black Republican party." Over it will wave the black banner of abolitionism, inscribed in letters dark as midnight, with the words, "destruction to the Constitution and a dissolution of the Union." Prominent in the left wing will be seen the Know-Nothing party, waving their blood-stained banner, inscribed with mottoes emanating from the dark ages, "Religious intolerance," and "war to the knife, and the knife to the hilt, against all of foreign birth."

Such, Mr. President, will be the opposing armies in the canvass of 1856. Every man, having either a vote or influence, will be called upon to enroll his name either in one army or the other. You will bear with me then, fellow-citizens, while I canvass briefly the merits and demerits of these contending parties.

Though secondary in importance, yet being first in chronological order, you will allow me to bestow a few passing remarks upon the Know-Nothing organization.

Most secret societies claim great antiquity. The Masons date back to the building of Solomon's Temple. The Odd-Fellows to the covenant between Jonathan and David, recorded in the history of the first King of Israel. The Rachabites, to the life and times of Jonadab. But Know-Nothingism, can with more clearness, be traced back almost to the "fall of man." For in the days of Adam and Eve, it is recorded that "Cain talked with Abel his brother, and it came to pass when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against his brother and slew him. And the Lord said unto Cain, where is Abel thy brother? and he said I know not." This is the first historical account we have of Know-Nothingism. To the "I know not" of Cain may be ascribed, not only the name "Know-Nothings," but also the peculiar distinguishing feature of their organization, "deception and falsehood." Such a reprobate was this great founder of the Order, that the Almighty cursed him as a vagabond, and set a mark upon him, and he went out from the presence of the Lord and established Know-Nothingism in the land of Nod. For Lamech, the great great grandson of Cain "said unto his two wives Adah and Zilah, hear my voice ye wives of Lamech, harken unto my speech, for I have slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt. If Cain shall be avenged seven-fold, truly Lamech seventy and seven-fold."

The order then was founded in falsehood and blood, as witnessed by the murders of Cain and Lamech, and to this day its onward course is marked by rapine and blood-shed, as witnessed by the Native American and Know-Nothing riots in Philadelphia, Cincinnati and Louisville.

The next event in Know-Nothingism, in chronological order, to which I shall advert, you will find recorded in the old Levitical law. By this time it appears,

that in addition to murder and blood-shed, oppression of foreigners or strangers had become one of the distinguishing features of the order. The practice had become so common, even among God's own peculiar people, the children of Israel, that the Almighty himself, in the old Levitical law, made an express provision against it. You will find it recorded I think in Leviticus, 19th chapter, 33d and 34th verses. But if I am mistaken in the chapter and verse, you may read on until you find it, the reading will do you no harm. It is in these words:

"And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you, he shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself: for ye were strangers in, the land of Egypt. I am the Lord your God."

The analogy between the condition of the children of Israel, and the people of the United States, is too striking not to merit a passing notice. They had in the land of Egypt been subjected to the utmost oppression of the Know-Nothing Pharaohs. The Almighty himself, with a strong arm had delivered them, and brought them into a land flowing with milk and honey. The Canaanites had been driven from their homes and lands, in order to make room for the people of Israel. Yet no sooner were they established in the land of Canaan, than they turned Know-Nothings, and became so oppressive to foreigners and strangers, as to call forth the direct interposition of the Almighty. In like manner our fathers were subjected to the Know-Nothing oppression of the old world. Religious persecution and intolerance drove them across the broad Atlantic to the shores of North America. The same overruling Providence that watched over and guided them while crossing the boisterous ocean, drove back the Indian Tribes, and established our Pilgrim fathers in this "land of the free, and home of the brave." And now although we ourselves have scarcely ceased being strangers, where once roamed the wild savages of the forest; having possessed ourselves of their homes, and their pleasant hunting grounds, like the rebellious Israelites, our people are waging a war of extermination against the stranger, and rallying under the Know-Nothing cry of "death and destruction to all foreigners."

There is another fact fully demonstrated in this old Levitical code. Our fathers marked it, and seem to have been guided by it in the formation of our naturalization laws. A striking difference is made between the stranger who merely sojourns, or is a temporary resident among you, or who has merely declared his intentions of becoming a citizen; him "thou shalt not vex." But the one who dwells among you; who has become a citizen; who has taken the oath of allegiance; who has foresworn allegiance to every foreign Prince, Potentate or Power; "he shall be unto you as one born among you. Thou shalt love him as thyself." For ye were once strangers in this pleasant land wherein now ye dwell.

The Tories of the Revolution were peculiarly a Know-Nothing party; George the Third made it one of the distinguishing features of his reign. Your revolutionary fathers found it so oppressive, that they declared it one of the causes of their separation from the mother country. They placed it upon record in the Declaration of Independence, that the history of the reign of George Third was "a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object, the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States." Because among other things, "he has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose, obstructing the laws for the naturalization of foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the condition of new appropriation of lands."

I repeat, my fellow-citizens, "the Tories of the Revolution were peculiarly the Know-Nothings of their day." Your Revolutionary fathers entered their solemn

protest against their doctrines in the Declaration of Independence. In the maintenance of that protest, they waged a seven years war; and upon the battle-fields of the Revolution they spilt their blood, and gave up their lives, rather than subject themselves and their posterity to such odious tyranny.

Know-Nothingism next manifested itself in the old alien laws of 'the elder Adams.' They were odious in the extreme to the American people, and speedily overthrown by the Democratic party, under the lead of the Sage of Monticello.

It appeared again about 1840 under the name of "Native Americanism." Its short-lived existence was marked by the shooting down of unoffending citizens in the streets of Philadelphia, and the burning of the Ursuline Convent, and churches dedicated to the worship of the ever-living God.

I must be permitted to retrace my steps a little in my historical account of the order.

The first settlers of this country were men who had tasted the bitter effects of Know-Nothingism in the mother country. Religious persecution and intolerance, drove the Puritans to Plymouth Rock; the Catholics to Maryland; and the Quakers to Pennsylvania. They all fled from the persecutions occasioned by the religious intolerance of the Know-Nothings. They choose rather to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience, in the far off wilderness, than to submit to the persecutions of the old world.

No wonder then, that our fathers in the formation of our Government, should by constitutional provisions guard against its baleful influence. The 3d section of the 6th Art. of the Constitution provides, that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust, under the United States."

How will our Know-Nothing friends reconcile this, with the article in their Creed, which requires them to bind themselves by solemn oath to vote against any and every one professing the Catholic religion?

With even this constitutional provision, our fathers were not satisfied. They had seen in the old world the connection of Church and State. They had seen established by law, particular forms of religion, for the maintenance of which all other denominations were compelled to contribute a support. Consequently, they were not satisfied until they had so amended our Constitution as to make it provide still further, that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the the freedom of speech, or the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

In this clause they make the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, just as sacred as the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right peaceably to assemble, or even the right to petition Government for the redress of grievances.

Just so you will find that in most every State in the Union, either in its Constitution, or its Bill of Rights, it has prohibited all religious tests as a qualification for office, and guaranteed to every man, the lowest as well as the highest, the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

I will not trouble you by referring to the Constitutions and Bills of Rights of the different States, but I must be pardoned for referring more minutely to those of our own State.

The first Constitution adopted in 1802, in the 3d section of the Bill of Rights, provides, "That all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God, according to the dictates of conscience; that no human authority can in any case whatever control or interfere with the rights of conscience; that no man shall be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent; and that no preference



shall ever be given, by law, to any religious society or mode of worship, and no religious test shall ever be required, as a qualification, to any office of trust or profit. But religion, morality and knowledge, being essentially necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of instruction shall forever be encouraged by legislative provision, not inconsistent with the rights of conscience."

This article not only prohibits any religious test as a qualification to any office of trust or profit, but it also declares that every man's right to his own religious belief is one that no human authority can take from him. That it is heaven-born; the gift of God; one that he cannot even himself part with, no matter how many oaths may have been imposed upon him by a Know-Nothing Lodge.

One might have reasonably supposed that this constitutional guarantee would have satisfied the good people of Ohio; but not so. In the 7th section of the Bill of Rights, in the new constitution adopted in 1851, they not only repeat the exact language of the old, but they add that, "it shall be the duty of the General Assembly to pass suitable laws to protect every religious denomination in the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of public worship, and to encourage schools and the means of instruction."

By this clause in the new constitution, it would seem as though the Convention of 1851 foresaw what Know-Nothingism would soon lead to, and consequently made it imperative on the General Assembly to protect every religious denomination against any interference with the rights of conscience, by the persecuting and intolerant Know-Nothings.

But, Mr. President, with the denunciations of the Almighty, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the constitution of nearly every State in the Union, staring them in the face, the Know-Nothings bind themselves by horrid oaths to proscribe every man who worship Almighty God, according to the forms of the Catholic Church; and this they tell us is necessary in order to put down Popery in the country. Catholicism they say is dangerous to our Government. Yes, Mr. President, these brave Know-Nothings would frighten old women and silly children with the Pope of Rome! At the same time they know or ought to know, that as a temporal sovereign, the Pope of Rome is no more to be feared than the Musquito King. Why, sir, were it not for the bayonets of Louis Napoleon, the Pope could not for a single day hold his temporal power even in the city of Rome.

But, sir, what evidence have we that the Catholics of the United States are not just as good citizens as are the Protestants? Have they not been as willing to fight the battles of the country? Were they not as true, and as brave upon the battle-fields of Mexico, notwithstanding they were fighting against a country where the Pope of Rome was the acknowledged head of the church, and where the only religion was Catholicism?

Again, sir, are not the Catholics out-numbered by the Presbyterians, by the Baptists, by the Methodists, and other denominations of Christians in this country? Does not the census of 1850 demonstrate that the Catholics in the United States are less than one to twelve compared with the Protestants? And yet, with your tens of thousands of Protestant preachers, with all your Bible societies, and Tract societies, with the fullest freedom of speech, and the liberty of the press, these brave Know-Nothings are afraid of the Pope of Rome! With the book of martyrs, with its horrid pictures of fire and faggot, with its wonderful revelations of the awful tortures of the Inquisition and the burning of John Rogers, and with the revelations of Maria Monk, and an escaped Nun in their hands, they visit from house to house, to stir up prejudice against the peaceable and unoffending Catholics.

But if our people would stop a moment, Mr. President, and reflect, that the history of the church every-where, demonstrate the fact, that the persecuted, as soon as they obtain power, in turn become the persecutors, it would do much to soften this prejudice. The Catholics under Mary, persecuted the Protestants, the Protestants under Elizabeth, persecuted the Catholics. Persecution drove the Pilgrim Fathers to Plymouth Rock. The Pilgrim Fathers in turn became the persecutors of the Quakers and the Baptists. Our fathers had seen all this, and in the formation of our government, wisely guarded against giving any one denomination the power over another; and in the Constitution, the great Charter of all our liberties, they guaranteed to every man his heaven-born right, "to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of his own conscience." They acted upon the great truth, that "even error is harmless, whilst reason is left free to combat it."

But what astonishes me more than any thing else, Mr. President, is, that so many good men, so many professing christians; nay, more, so many preachers who profess to teach the doctrines of Him whose mission to this world angels proclaimed to be "peace upon earth, and good will to men," should lend their names and their influence to an organization so utterly at variance with the laws of God, the Constitution of our country, and the very spirit of our free institutions.

Why, sir, I verily believe that Know-Nothingism has done more in three short years, to turn this land into a land of infidels, than all the writings of Tom Paine, Voltaire, and other infidel authors could do in two centuries.

In a country like this, with a government in which every man may aspire to the highest office in the gift of the people, let it once be understood that a man is proscribed because he belongs to a particular church, (for any one with half an eye, can see that one church as well as another, may fall before the proscriptive intolerance of Know-Nothingism,) and you place before every man a direct inducement to stand aloof from all church organizations.

Allow me, Mr. President, in this connexion, inasmuch as the larger portion of the Know-Nothings in the United States were once Clay Whigs, to give you Mr. Clay's opinion of Catholics. I read from his speech in Congress on the emancipation of South American, March 24, 1818:

"With regard to their superstition, they worship the same God with us. *Their prayers are offered up in their temples to the same Redeemer, whose intercession we expect to save us.* NOR IS THERE ANY THING IN THE CATHOLIC RELIGION UNFAVORABLE TO FREEDOM. All religions united with government are more or less inimicable to Liberty. All separated from the government are compatible with liberty."

France, when at the commencement of the reign of terror, Know-Nothingism destroyed her churches and proscribed her religion, notwithstanding that religion was only Catholicism, became a land of infidels. Instead of worshipping the God who made them, and the Christ who redeemed them, they worshipped the Goddess of Reason, personified by an abandoned female. Her people soon denied the very existence of a God. Her orators, while addressing their infidel hearers, could exclaim in the blasphemous language of Condorset, "there is no God: if there be a God, I defy thee to strike me dead!—no! there is no God." Such, my countrymen, was the work of Know-Nothingism in France. "Like causes producing like effects," we may well say, such may be the effect of Know-Nothingism in the United States. Let christians then—let the ministry pause in their mad career, before they lend their influence to such a God-forbidden, infidel-making, Constitution-breaking organization.

Permit me, Mr. President, to dwell for a few moments upon that branch of Know-Nothingism which wages an indiscriminate warfare against every person of foreign birth.

Whence arises this prejudice against foreigners? It was not so in the days of the Revolution; then we could welcome them to our shores; then we could hail with joyful acclamation the approach of the French fleet, bringing us aid and comfort; bringing men to help fight our battle, and means for the subsistence of our army. The nation still bear in grateful remembrance the names of Lafayette, Montgomery, Mercer, Sturges, DeKalb, Pulaski, Kosciusko, and a host of others, who volunteered to aid us in the dark hours of the Revolution. I ask these Know-Nothings, whose constant cry is, "America for Americans," to go to the battlefields of the Revolution, and sponge from their soil the blood of those brave foreigners, who fell fighting gallantly for that freedom which we now enjoy. Nay, more, jackall like, dig up their very bones and send them out of the country, because "America is for Americans."

Sir, who wants America for any other than Americans? Does any party advocate the giving of America to foreigners? Has not the old time-honored Democratic party always been for America and Americans? In war and in peace Democrats have always been for their own country, and their own countrymen. Why, then, do they cast into our teeth that "America is for Americans?" Sir, the Constitution guarantees that "America is for Americans," and the Democracy are ever found standing by the Constitution. It prohibits foreigners from holding office in the country. Not until they become American citizens are they even permitted to vote for those who are by the Constitution entitled to hold the offices.

But, Mr. President, whilst the Constitution does this—whilst it proclaims that "America is for Americans," it opens wide the door to admit the down-trodden and oppressed of all the world. To the man who has felt the tyranny, and endured the oppression of other lands, who has cast a longing eye across the broad Atlantic to this "land of the free, and home of the brave;" who, out of pure love for our free institutions, is willing to leave home and friends in his father-land, who forswears all allegiance to any foreign Prince, Potentate or Power, and takes an oath to support our Constitution, after five years residence, it makes him an American citizen. He then becomes one of us, and one with us. Our country is then his country, our Constitution is his constitution, and still "America is for Americans."

If we have a Know-Nothing with us in this meeting, in all candor, I ask him what do you expect to gain by preventing the naturalization of foreigners? You may, it is true, nay, you have already fearfully lessened immigration to the United States. But what portion of the population of the old world do you keep back? Not the trash; not the idle and worthless. Citizenship makes no difference to them. Bread—a bare subsistence is what they want. Citizenship, or no citizenship, they come. But by your policy, you drive back the better portion of foreigners; you drive back those who would come here, because they understand and love our form of government. You drive back those who would prize citizenship in the United States as the greatest earthly boon they could possess. Foreigners you must and will have here, unless you build a Chinese wall to exclude them! Is it not better then to encourage the migration hither of the better portion of the foreign population?

Again, to my Know-Nothing friend, I would say, you propose that the foreigner who is with us, or who may land upon our shores, notwithstanding he proposes to spend his days with us, shall all his lifetime, or at the very shortest period, for twenty-one years, remain a foreigner. You propose to make them feel that their interest in our government is not the same as our interests. You would treat them as aliens and enemies, until it would not be your fault if they did not become enemies indeed.

On the contrary, the Democracy would, as fast as they are qualified, convert

them into Americans by interest, Americans in heart, Americans by citizenship. Your policy would fill the land with riot and blood-shed; would extend the horrid scenes of Cincinnati and Louisville until they spread over the whole United States. Our policy, on the contrary, would induce them to feel as did Ruth, when she exclaimed to Naomi, "entreat me not to leave thee, thy people shall be my people, and thy God shall be my God."

Mr. President, in this connexion, as contrasting beautifully with the proscription spirit of Know-Nothingism, permit me to read an extract from Mr. Clay's great speech in the Senate of the United States, in defence of the American system. Mr. Clay said:

"The honest, patient, industrious GERMAN readily unites with our people, establishes himself on some of our fat lands, fills his capacious barns, and enjoys in tranquillity the abundant fruits which his diligence gathers around him, always ready to fly to the standard of his adopted country, or of its laws, when called by duties of patriotism.

"The gay, the versatile, the philosophical FRENCHMAN, accommodating himself cheerfully to all the vicissitudes of life, incorporates himself without difficulty in our society.

"But of all foreigners, none amalgamate themselves so quickly with our people as the NATIVES OF THE EMERALD ISLE. In some of the visions which have passed through my imagination, I have supposed that Ireland was originally part and parcel of this continent, and that by some extraordinary convulsion of nature, it was torn from America, and drifting across the ocean, was placed in the unfortunate vicinity of Great Britain.

"The same open-heartedness, the same generous hospitality, the same careless and uncalculating indifference about human life, characterised the inhabitants of both countries. Kentucky has sometimes been called the Ireland of America. And I have no doubt that if the current of emigration were reversed, and set from America upon the shores of Europe, every American emigrant to Ireland would there find, as every Irish emigrant here finds, a hearty welcome, and a happy home."

Such, sir, was the warm, generous sentiment, expressed by this gallant old Kentuckian towards the French, the German, and the Irish emigrants. How would his heart bleed, were he now alive to see Kentuckians, aye sir, Kentuckians, shooting and stabbing unoffending peaceable citizens—nay, more, murdering unresisting women and children, upon the soil of his own beloved Kentucky, for the damning sin of having been born in a foreign land?

The language of Mr. Clay should mantle with shame the cheek of any unfortunate Clay Whig, who has been inveigled into such an organization. I say to him, as he used to sing in 1840, "come out from among the foul party."

Again, Mr. President, I repeat the question with which I commenced the examination of this branch of Know-Nothingism. Why at this time, this unrelenting warfare upon all of foreign birth? There are those who can answer. Nine out of ten of all the foreigners who land upon our shores have felt the hand of tyranny and oppression laid heavily upon them, by the Lords, Kings, and Emperors of the old world. They have learned to appreciate our government as a government of the people. When they land here, they find the Democratic party the party of the people; and consequently, when they become citizens, and are permitted to vote, their hand but manifests what is in their heart, when it deposits a Democratic ballot. The opposition have long seen and felt this, and have coaxed and threatened them; still they have remained true to what they considered the best interest of their adopted country, and continued to act with the Democracy. The last grand effort of the opposition to coax them out of their votes, was in 1852, when their candidate for the presidency, notwithstanding he had formerly been the Native American leader, and proclaimed himself as "burning with indignation against those of foreign birth," could traverse the United States, talking about the "sweet German accent," and the "rich Irish brogue."

The device was too flimsy. The bait did not take. The Irish and Germans still voted for the Democratic nominee. Then commenced this unrelenting warfare; then burst forth the long pent-up venom of their hearts. Then they drew

the knife, and threw away the scabbard. Riot, bloodshed, and desolation, have since marked their progress.

Such, Mr. President, and fellow-citizens, without entering into the minutiae of this dark lantern, midnight, oath-bound organization, is Know-Nothingism. Its doctrines are in direct violation of the laws of God, and the Constitution of our country. It is an organization, which as it becomes understood, becomes more and more odious to the American people. I trust, sir, that an organization so utterly at variance with the spirit of our free institutions, may receive "a sudden death, a deep grave, and no resurrection."

I will, Mr. President, with your permission, next proceed to examine Black Republicanism.

It is made up of old line Abolitionists; much the larger portion of the old Whig party, and such disaffected Democrats as have been disappointed in obtaining office.

It is peculiarly a sectional party. Just such an one as Washington's prophetic eye saw would destroy our Government if it ever became the dominant party in the country. This party is emphatically the "one idea" party. Its life-blood is the prejudice of our northern people against the institutions of slavery.

I do not stand here to-night for the purpose, neither does the advocacy of Democratic principles require me to defend slavery. It was here when our Government was formed. The framers of the Constitution well considered it. Just where they left it, there am I willing to leave it. There the Democratic party leave it. If the Constitution is pro-slavery, then just so far am I and the Democratic party proslavery, and no further. We are willing to stand by the Constitution of our country; and if we fall, we fall in the support of the "fairest fabric of human government that ever rose to animate the hopes of civilized man."

The Democracy for their guidance, will continue to look to the Constitution; calling to their aid, for its fair and honest construction, the circumstances which demanded and caused its formation.

At the time when our national Constitution was made, there were thirteen independent sovereign States. These States, although each one was acting in its sovereign capacity, made common cause in their war of independence. But after that independence had been achieved, "in order to form a more perfect Union," for the purpose, as they say, in the preamble of the Constitution, "of establishing justice, insuring domestic tranquillity, providing for the common defence, promoting the general welfare, and securing the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity," they formed a Federal Government. The States did not relinquish their sovereignty by so doing; on the contrary, in the Constitution, which is the foundation of that government, they expressly declared "that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." The general Government, then, is a government with only delegated powers.

The Black Republicans claim that Congress has power to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories; the Democracy on the contrary contend that slavery is a local institution, and controlled and regulated only by the people of the particular State in which it exists, and that the people of a territory have a right to reject or establish it, as they may see fit.

Slavery existed in most of the States at the time the Constitution was formed. It was a difficult and disturbing question then. Its satisfactory settlement, taxed to the utmost, the wisdom, the patriotism and the self-denial of the men who formed that instrument. With the exception of the right to re-capture fugitive slaves, and the right to abolish the slave-trade after the year 1808, they wisely

excluded everything connected with slavery from the Constitution. Indeed so plain is this that even the Black Republicans themselves, when driven to the wall, fully admit that Congress has no power over slavery in the States. I will therefore confine myself to the question of slavery in the Territories.

Mr. President, if Congress has the right to legislate slavery, either into, or out of the Territories, that power must be found in the Constitution. It won't do for the Black Republicans to tell me that Congress has exercised the power, and therefore it is all right. In the language of Gen. Cass, "If we have departed from the Constitution, it is high time for us to return to the Constitution."

Let us see then what the Constitution says upon the subject.

The 8th section of the 1st art. of the Constitution, in enumerating what things Congress may do among others, it gives the power "to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular States and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings."

Here the Constitution has given in express and direct terms the power to legislate—that is to pass laws for, and obligatory upon such localities. Now I ask in all candor, if the men who made the Constitution, (for every one must admit that they understood the import and meaning of words, and intended to avoid all ambiguity,) had intended to give Congress the power to legislate for the Territories, would they not have said so in this clause? It would have been an easy matter for them, after having given the power to legislate over the District of Columbia, to have added these words, "and to exercise like authority over the Territories of the United States;" but not so. They provided for them in another and entirely different way. The last clause of the 3d sec., of the 4th art. of the Constitution says:

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular States."

It is in this clause that the Black Republicans claim that Congress has power to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the territories. They say it is found in these words, "and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

I have already shown you, that when speaking of the District of Columbia, and such places as have been purchased, mark you, by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings, they use the word "legislation;" but in the clause which I have just read, they have carefully excluded every and all such words as "legislate," "make laws," and those of like import, and have substituted the words "make needful rules and regulations."

I contend, Mr. President, that these words have no reference whatever to the government of the territory, and that they apply exclusively to the disposal of the territory or other property of the United States. "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations, respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States." Congress shall have power to dispose of the territory, that is the land or other property belonging to the United States, and for that purpose they shall make all needful rules and regulations for the carrying out of such disposal.

Such for instance, as requiring the territory or land to be surveyed—laid off

into sections, half sections, &c., requiring them to be offered at public sale, and fixing the price. In other words, Congress shall have the same power over the territories, that it has over the other property belonging to the United States. Bearing in mind the other clause to which I have referred, the one relating to legislation for the District of Columbia, and this clause will admit of no other construction than the one I have given it. Take the words "territory or other property," in connexion with what follows, and it becomes so plain, that "he who runs may read." "And nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State." It connects the Territory, that is, the lands belonging to the United States, with the other property of the United States, and gives Congress the power to dispose of these lands, as well as the other property, and then provides that nothing in the Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims which the United States, or any individual State may have in those lands or other property. The question of right, or title, is to be settled by the judiciary as provided for elsewhere in the Constitution.

Mr. President, to put any other construction upon this clause of the Constitution, than the one I have given it, will be to open the door for every species of legislation by Congress for the territories. If the words, "make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States," gives Congress the right to either establish or prohibit slavery, it gives it the right to regulate slavery in the territory; and if it gives the right to regulate the relations subsisting between the master and his slave, it gives the right to regulate the relation between husband and wife, between parent and child, between the guardian and his ward. Such a construction, would do away with all territorial legislation, and vest that power exclusively in Congress. It would place the territories in precisely the condition of the District of Columbia. Now then, I ask, if the makers of the Constitution had intended this, why did they not put the territories into the clause of the Constitution relating to that District? I repeat, the men who made the Constitution knew the import of words; they expressed themselves clearly, and without ambiguity. They never used two words, when one would convey their meaning, nor did they make two clauses in the Constitution, when one would have answered. It will not do to stultify them in order to obtain doubtful powers.

If then, the power for Congress to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the territories is not found in this clause of the Constitution, it nowhere exists; and Congress has no such power.

This brings us then exactly to the position occupied by the Democratic party. They say that Congress has no power whatever over the subject of slavery; that it is a local institution, each State may establish or abolish it without any dictation from Congress; that the Territories of the United States have the right "to regulate their domestic institutions in their own way," that they may either establish, or prohibit slavery, just as they may think proper, without let or hindrance from the Congress of the United States. This is the position occupied by the National Democracy, as manifested by the resolutions of their last National Convention, and which beyond a doubt, you will see reaffirmed by them in Convention, on the first Monday of June next. It is also the position now occupied by the Democratic party in Ohio. In their last 8th of January Convention, they resolved—

"1st. That slavery is a domestic institution, and that Congress has neither the power to legislate it into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States.

"2d. That the right of the people of each particular State and Territory to establish

their own Constitution or form of government; to choose and regulate their own domestic institutions of every kind, and to legislate for themselves, is a fundamental principle of all free government, and that it is the self-same right to secure which our ancestors waged the war of the Revolution; a right lying at the very foundation of all our free institutions, recognized in the Declaration of Independence, and established by the Constitution of the United States; and we hereby endorse and reaffirm this now disputed principle."

It is also the doctrine of the Kansas-Nebraska bill; for the passage of which the Democracy have been denounced by the one-idea men from one end of the country to the other.

That bill provides that Kansas and Nebraska, when they apply for admission into the Union, shall be admitted either with or without slavery, as their people may determine for themselves in their constitution. It is but a repetition of the language used in the law, organizing a Territorial government for Utah and New Mexico, which constituted one of the Compromises of 1850. Compromises so satisfactory to the country, as to call forth the endorsement of both Democrats and Whigs, in their National Conventions of 1852.

Why then, I ask, are the Democracy now assailed for maintaining precisely the doctrine of the Compromises of 1850, for occupying precisely the position assumed by both the National Whigs, and the National Democrats, in their platforms of 1852?

Thousands of Democrats, and tens of thousands of Whigs, who have abandoned their party organization, and joined the Black Republicans, will still admit, that they are satisfied with the compromises of 1850; that is, they are satisfied with the Utah and New Mexico law, which, provides for admitting these territories into the Union, either with or without slavery, as they may determine in their constitutions, but they are not satisfied with the Kansas-Nebraska bill, containing but a repetition of the very language used in the Utah and New Mexico law, because say they, you have repealed the Missouri restriction.

Sir, if Congress has no right under the Constitution, either to establish or prohibit slavery in the Territories, the Missouri restriction itself was unconstitutional, and its repeal was nothing more than taking from the statute book an unconstitutional law, and that being admitted, would be an end to all argument.

But I will for the present waive the constitutional question, in order to meet the Black Republicans face to face upon the merits of the Missouri Compromise.

They are now constantly harping upon the opinion of Col. Benton, as to the sacredness of this compromise, as expressed in his speech against the Kansas-Nebraska bill. Allow me, sir, to refute Col. Benton of 1854, by Col. Benton in 1852. At that time he is reported as saying—

"I do not believe in the compromises made by politicians, candidates for the Presidency. I have seen too much of such work.

"What was ever more boasted than the compromise of 1833? or more worshiped in its day? or more sworn by? or more relied upon to save the Union? or more ferociously adhered to for its hour, as the watchword of party? or more omnipotent over delicate nerves and attenuated pates? or made a more inexorable test of political salvation or damnation? and what more utterly and ignominiously abandoned, and by all its followers, high priests and disciples, the moment it was found that it would make nobody President? It was my prerogative to see through that contrivance at the time of its device, and to think as little of it at its birth as its author did at its death.

"The compromise of 1820 had also its day of laudation and glory; but it made nobody President, and now it is despised: Abjuration of it is the order of the day. Repudiation of the authority to make it a test for the Presidency, and judicial decisions treat it as a nullity. The compromise of 1850, is in the first place, a deception, the compromise bill having failed, and its conglomerated measure passed separately as independent measures, and with very little help from their present assumptions guardians. In the second place, it was contrived upon the avowed ground that it was to make its cham-



pious Presidents. And is now stuck to upon that principle; and if it fails to do the job, it will take the track of its two defunct predecessors, and soon be with them, "IN THE TOMBS OF THE CAPULETS."

"This is my experience of Congress compromises, and nobody need set up these little clay gods for me to worship, especially when those who set them up do it for a purpose, and knock them down when they don't answer it."

It is acknowledged by all, Mr. President, even by the Black Republicans themselves, that in 1820, when the Missouri Compromise was adopted, it was against the wishes and the votes of the northern people. It was not at that time a northern measure. Now then, sir, I ask in all fairness, at what time did our northern people change front, and become the peculiar advocates of the Missouri Compromise? I have with much care searched the records of the country, in order to ascertain this fact. And I aver, that from 1820 to 1854, you cannot find the first recorded vote in the Congress of the United States, in which a majority of the northern representatives have recognized the validity of the Missouri Compromise. On the contrary, again and again, they placed themselves upon the record against it. Nay, sir, I go still further: from 1820 to 1854, you cannot find the first northern legislature which has recognized the validity of the Missouri Compromise; on the contrary, again and again, they have denounced it. Nay more, sir, I aver still further, that from 1820 to 1854, you cannot find the first northern meeting which has favored the measure; on the contrary, again and again, they have condemned it, and denounced and burnt in effigy the northern men, who in 1820 voted for it. No, sir, not until the Kansas-Nebraska bill was reported in the Senate of the United States; not until Giddings, Chase, and Wade and their Abolition confederates had flooded the country with their manifesto, denouncing the bill as a breach of "plighted faith," as a bill to establish slavery in Kansas and Nebraska, did our northern people become the peculiar friends of the Missouri compromise. The political existence of these men depended upon the slavery agitation. They saw that the principles of the Kansas-Nebraska bill once established, the slavery question would be banished from the halls of Congress. They saw indeed, that when slavery was made what the Constitution made it—a local question, "Othello's occupation would be gone;" hence their manifesto. The cry, a "breach of plighted faith" made the disaffected of all parties, the prejudiced, the one-idea men without an investigation into the truth, or the untruth of the charge, rush to the Abolition standard.

Now then, Mr. President, let us see whether or not this law establishes slavery in these Territories? If it does so, it is in these words:

"That the Constitution and all laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable, shall have the same force and effect within the said Territory of Nebraska, as elsewhere in the United States, except the eighth section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri into the Union, approved March sixth, eighteen hundred and twenty, which, being inconsistent with the principle of non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the States and Territories, as recognized by the legislation of eighteen hundred and fifty, commonly called the Compromise measures, is hereby declared inoperative and void; it being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States: Provided, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to revive or put in force any law or regulation which may have existed prior to the act of sixth March, eighteen hundred and twenty, either protecting, establishing, prohibiting, or abolishing slavery."

So far from this establishing slavery, it expressly says:

"It being the true intent and meaning of this act, not to legislate slavery into any State or Territory, nor to exclude therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way."

But I may be told perhaps, that by the repeal of the Missouri restriction, we

revived the old French law upon the subject of slavery, which was in force when we acquired the territory. On the contrary, we expressly guarded the bill against any such construction, in the following words:

"That nothing herein contained shall be construed to revive or put in force any law or regulation which may have existed prior to the act of the 6th of March, 1820, either protecting, establishing, or prohibiting slavery."

Thus you will see that it was the true intent and meaning of the law, to leave the people of Kansas and Nebraska, just as "free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way," as were our pilgrim fathers, when they landed upon Plymouth Rock.

Indeed, Mr. President, the head and front of our offending in the Kansas Nebraska bill was, in "leaving the people perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way." If we had disregarded the natural, the inherent, the God-given right of the people, and in violation of the Constitution, dictated to them, their domestic institutions, all would have been satisfactory to our Black Republican friends.

I said, sir, that if we had disregarded "the natural, inherent right of the people," and I mean just what I said. I mean that the right to establish government, is one that is inherent in the people; they not only have the right to establish their own government, but they have also at all times the right to alter, change, or even abolish their government. In this State, and I think in most of the States, the people have placed this God-given right in their Bill of Rights. In ours, our fathers affirmed the doctrine when they made our first Constitution, in 1802, and we reiterated it in the new Constitution in 1851, in these words:

"All political power is inherent in the people. Government is instituted for their equal protection and benefit, and they have the right to alter, reform, or abolish the same, whenever they may deem it necessary."

The dictation then, by the Congress, to the people of a territory respecting their domestic institutions, is but an usurpation of power; such an one exactly as our revolutionary fathers rebelled against when George the Third attempted its exercise over the old Thirteen Colonies.

So vital to the existence of liberty did our revolutionary fathers regard this principle, that they would not consent to form a confederation, or put forth a declaration of independence, without reserving to each State respectively, the right to regulate its own internal police.

Pennsylvania, when she consented to send representatives for the purpose of forming a confederation, instructed them by the following resolution:

"Reserving to the people of this colony the sole and exclusive right of regulating the internal government and police of the same."

And in a subsequent instruction, in reference to suppressing the British authority in the colonies, Pennsylvania uses the following emphatic language:

"Unanimously declare our willingness to concur in a vote of the Congress declaring the United Colonies free and independent States, provided the forming the government, and the regulation of the internal police of this colony, be always reserved to the people of the said colony."

New Jersey instructed her representatives in the following language:

"Always observing that, whatever plan of confederacy you enter into, the regulating the internal police of this province is to be reserved to the colonial legislature."

Maryland gave her consent to the Declaration of Independence upon the condition contained in this proviso:

"And that said colony will hold itself bound by the resolution of a majority of the United Colonies in the premises, provided the sole and exclusive right of regulating the internal government and police of that colony be reserved to the people thereof."

New Hampshire annexed this proviso to her instructions to her delegates to vote for independence:

"Provided the regulation of our internal police be under the direction of our own assembly."

Connecticut, in authorizing her delegates to vote for the Declaration of Independence, attached to it the following condition:

"Saying that the administration of government, and the power of forming governments for, and the regulation of the internal concerns and police of each colony, ought to be left and remain to the respective colonial legislatures."

Virginia annexed the following condition to her instructions to vote for the Declaration of Independence:

"Provided, that the power of forming governments for, and the regulations of the internal concerns of the colony, be left to the respective colonial legislatures."

Mr. President, so dear was this God-given right, the right of the people to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, that your revolutionary fathers would not surrender it, no, not even to free themselves from the tyranny of the mother country.

The Tories of the Revolution took the opposite side. They contended that George the Third, and the Parliament of Great Britain, should control and dictate the legislation of the Colonies. Our Black Republican friends are now espousing, and moving heaven and earth to establish precisely the same doctrine of the old Tory party.

But, Mr. President, I am at a loss to know why it is that the Abolition Black Republican party, are afraid to trust the people of Kansas and Nebraska to "form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way?" Have they so little confidence in the people that they are afraid to trust them? That they must have Congress to exercise a guardianship over them? Have not the people, always been true to themselves?

Sir, a moment's reflection ought to satisfy the men of the North, that they may safely trust the question of slavery to the people. If any section of the country ought to hold an opposite policy, it should be the South, and not the North.

When you formed your national Constitution, slavery existed in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, and other northern States. It does not however exist in those States to-day. How then has it disappeared? By any law of Congress? No, sir; for when these States joined the confederation, they reserved the right to themselves, to "form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way." But slavery has disappeared. The people of those States in the exercise of their God-given right, when they found slavery no longer profitable themselves, abolished it.

Notwithstanding the ordinance of '87, slavery existed in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin. I repeat, notwithstanding the Congressional prohibition in the ordinance of '87, slavery existed in all the northwest territory. Not legally, not constitutionally perhaps, yet the census of the United States, at different times, shows that there were slaves in Ohio, in Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin. But there are none there now—they have disappeared, not in consequence of the ordinance of '87, for under that they were there. But the people of the northwest territory in the exercise of their God-given right to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, when they formed State constitutions for themselves, forever excluded slavery.

Iowa was a part of the Louisiana purchase, and north of 36 deg. 30 min., and consequently covered by the Missouri restriction; nevertheless, slavery existed in Iowa, at the very time too, when she was a territory, and consequently at the very time when the Missouri restriction (if it had any validity) would have been operative. But no slavery exists in Iowa now. The people of that

territory, when they formed a State constitution, in the exercise of their natural and inherent right to "form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way," excluded it.

But, Mr. President, I stop not here. There is not a foot of soil belonging to the United States, which was free when we acquired it, in which slavery did not exist when it became the property of the United States, in which the people in the exercise of their right to "form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way," have established it. Why then, I repeat the question, are our northern men afraid to trust the people?

And, sir, should slavery go into Kansas, should she become an exception to the past history of the country, before God, I believe that our northern people will be the means of it, not by the repeal of the Missouri restriction, but as a natural consequence of the policy pursued by northern fanatics; such men as Governors Chase and Clark, and the Rev. (?) Henry Ward Beecher. Mr Clay prophetically foretold just what is now transpiring in Kansas, nay, the whole country, in his speech against the abolitionist, in the Senate of the United States, on the 7th February, 1839. He said:

"Sir, I am not in the habit of speaking lightly of the possibility of dissolving this happy Union. The Senate know that I have deprecated allusions, on ordinary occasions, to that direful event. The country will testify that, if there be anything in the history of my public career worthy of recollection, it is the truth and sincerity of my ardent devotion to its lasting preservation. But we should be false in our allegiance to it, if we did not discriminate between the imaginary and real dangers by which it may be assailed. Abolitionism should no longer be regarded as an imaginary danger. The abolitionists, let me suppose, succeed in their present aim, of uniting the inhabitants of the free States, as one man, against the inhabitants of the slave States. Union on one side, will beget union on the other, and this process of reciprocal consolidation, will be attended with all the violent prejudice, embittered passions, and implacable animosities which ever degraded, or deformed human nature. \* \* \* One section will stand in menacing and hostile array against the other. The collision of opinion will be quickly followed by the clash of arms. I will not attempt to describe scenes which now happily lie concealed from our view. Abolitionists themselves would shrink back in dismay and horror at the contemplation of desolated fields, conflagrated cities, murdered inhabitants, and the overthrow of the fairest fabric of human government that ever rose to animate the hopes of civilized man."

It would seem as though Mr. Clay, in the language which I have just repeated, foresaw precisely, what we see now transpiring in the country. The efforts of northern abolitionists to forestall the action of the people of Kansas, in the formation of their domestic institutions, has been met by similar efforts upon the part of the people of Missouri. This collision of opinion, has been quickly followed by the clash of arms, and unwilling to wait for the action of the constitutionally established authorities, your newly elected abolition Governor, in a message, or perhaps with more propriety I should say, in a proclamation, characterized in the language of Mr. Clay, by the "most violent prejudice, embittered passion and implacable animosity which ever degraded, or deformed human nature," attempts to fan the flame, and provoke a civil war.

Following this message of Gov. Chase, a bill is reported, and entertained by our Black Republican Legislature for raising five regiments of men, to be sent into Kansas. Next comes a petition for the dissolution of the Union. This too, by our Know-Nothing Black Republican legislature, is received and respectfully referred to one of its standing committees.

The Governors of New York and Rhode Island follow in the foot-steps of Gov. Chase and Reverend fanatics, like Henry Ward Beecher, instead of preaching "*peace upon earth, and good will to men,*" from the sacred desk, and on God's holy Sabbath day, counsel the use of Sharp's rifles and Colt's revolvers. God help us, Mr. President, if such men are long to have the reigns of government, and such mad fanatics are to be our spiritual teachers.

Is it not time for all good men, and all true national men, to unite with the Democracy, and help us turn back this tide of fanaticism?

Your Black Republican Governors, Know-Nothing Black Republican legislatures and fanatical preachers, are doing all in their power to promote a civil war. They are placing themselves in opposition to the constituted authorities of the country, and counseling open resistance to the execution of laws passed by the constituted authorities in Kansas. Have these mad fanatics forgotten the warning voice of such men as Washington and Jackson? The Father of his country, in his Farewell address, warns us against the very course of policy now being pursued by Gov. Chase and his abolition confederates. He says:

"The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government. All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and actions of the constituted authorities are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency."

Gen. Jackson, when about to retire from public life, adds his warning voice to that of Gen. Washington. In his Farewell address, he says:

"In order to maintain the Union unimpaired, it is absolutely necessary that the laws passed by the constituted authorities should be faithfully executed in every part of the country, and that every good citizen should at all times stand ready to put down, with the combined force of the nation, every attempt at unlawful resistance, under whatever pretext it may be made, or whatever shape it may assume."

I call upon every good American citizen to unite with Washington and Jackson in rebuking the action of such mad men as Chase and Clark, and Henry Ward Beecher, and their Black Republican confederates, in their efforts to provoke a civil war, that they know must in the end, prove fatal to the Union.

Mr. President, there is a constant cry upon the part of northern abolitionists about southern aggression, and southern dictation. I am not here to-night, for the purpose of defending the South, but I am here for the purpose of doing all in my power towards correcting the misrepresentations scattered broadcast over the northern States by the Abolitionists and Black Republicans; and for one, I am unable to discover from the past history of the country, in what this aggression, this dictation consists.

To me it is evident that there never was a charge so repeatedly and so confidently made that was so unfounded, and so easily refuted. Fanatics may listen to such an accusation, but those capable of appreciating the truth of history, will not be deceived by it.

When your national government was formed, the slave States by their representatives, were largely in the ascendancy in the Congress of the United States. It would have been an easy matter for them to have maintained that ascendancy. But did they do so? No, sir, they did not; but on the contrary, the slave States gave to freedom the territory out of which, enough free States have been formed to give the ascendancy permanently to the North.

Virginia gave the territory to form the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin: all of which have been admitted into the Union with constitutions forever excluding slavery. If Virginia and the South had been actuated by the spirit so unjustly charged upon them, how easy it would have been for them to have kept all this vast region of country as slave territory.

The Louisiana purchase is often charged as a southern measure. But to my mind, so far from demonstrating southern aggression, it proves precisely the contrary. When this mighty region of country was acquired, it was all by the existing laws of France, slave territory. But the South retained only Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri, for slave States, and gave beyond all question, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Washington, and in all probability Kansas too, to the formation of free States. And this is denominated southern aggression.

I repeat, Mr. President, the South, by its own generous acts, has given the preponderance to the North. By their own acts, southern statesmen have given the North the majority in both the Senate and House of Representatives of the American Congress. The South can never again attain their lost ascendancy.

Where then, is the encroachment of the South, about which we hear all this senseless jargon? The truth is, Mr. President, that under the laws of emigration and population, the comparative strength of the South, for all time to come, must continue to decrease, and that of the North as certainly to increase.

The North has always had the strength to go just as far in restraining slavery as they are permitted under the Constitution. That instrument gave express power to abolish the slave trade; and it has been done. Slavery can no longer be increased in the United States by the importation of slaves. Its only increase in future must be the result of the laws of population. The extension of slavery into any of the territories of the United States, would not increase the number of slaves; you might take one from Missouri into Kansas, still the number would be the same. The effect could only be to diminish the number in Missouri just in proportion to its increase in Kansas. So if you should annex Cuba, as you have Texas, the effect would not be to reduce a human being to bondage, neither would it be to extend the area of slavery. I once heard Garrett Smith, the great abolitionist of New York remark, that as a philanthropic measure, he would vote to annex Cuba, because slavery in the United States being preferable to slavery in Cuba, by so doing, he should be serving the cause of humanity.

I have already said that the slave representation can never again outnumber the free representation in Congress; we have nothing to fear on this score; the only effect then, of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, in its worst aspect, would be the removal of slaves from one locality to another. It can never increase the number of slaves in the United States, neither can it ever reduce a single human being to bondage.

Upon such an issue, the Black Republicans are periling all. To accomplish their ends, which when accomplished, (unless they intend to abolish slavery in the States,) would not free a single human being, they would in the language of Mr. Clay, "*overthrow the fairest fabric of human government that ever rose to animate the hopes of civilized man.*" Washington, in his last legacy to his countrymen, warned us to frown indignantly upon just such a course of policy as that now pursued by the Black Republicans.

Thomas Jefferson lamented over what he foresaw would be the result of such an organization. "I regret," says Mr. Jefferson, "that I am now to die in the belief that the useless sacrifice of themselves by the generation of 1776, to acquire self-government and happiness to their country, is to be thrown away by the unwise and unworthy passions of their sons, and that my only consolation is to be that I live not to weep over it. If they would but dispassionately weigh the blessings they will throw away against an abstract principle more likely to be affected by union than by scission, they would pause before they would perpetrate this act of suicide on themselves, and of treason against the hopes of the world."

Mr. Jefferson was no advocate of slavery, and would willingly have united his councils with those who were anxious to devise "some reasonable and practicable plan of getting rid of it." But he denounced sectionalism in all its forms, including the Missouri question. In the 7th volume of his writings, he says:

"The question is a mere party trick. The leaders of federalism, defeated in their schemes of obtaining power by rallying partisans to the principle of monarchism—a principle of personal, not of local division—have changed their tact and thrown out another barrel to the whale. They are taking advantage of the virtuous feeling of the people to effect a division of parties by a geographical line; they expect that this will insure them, on local principles, the majority they could never obtain on principle of federalism; but they

are still putting their shoulders to the wrong wheel; they are wasting Jeremiads on the miseries of slavery *as if we were advocates of it*. Sincerity in their declamations should direct their efforts to the true point of difficulty, and *unite their councils with ours in devising some reasonable and practicable plan of getting rid of it.*"

I ask in all candor, if what Mr. Jefferson said in 1820, is not exactly the condition of things now? Then it was a trick of Federalism to break down Democracy, it is now a trick of Black Republicanism to accomplish the same object. Then they were "taking advantage of the virtuous feelings of the people to effect a division of parties by geographical lines;" are they not now doing precisely the same thing? Then having been foiled in getting power upon "principles of federalism," they sought to obtain it on "local principles." Now, as then, they have their shoulders to the wrong wheel; for instead of uniting with us in "devising some reasonable and practicable plan of getting rid of slavery," they are using it merely for the purpose of obtaining power.

Inasmuch as the Black Republicans are constantly quoting Mr. Jefferson, as opposed to the position of the Democratic party upon the question of slavery, I must be permitted to make a few more extracts from his writings. In one of his letters to Mr. Adams, dated January 22, 1821, he says:

"Our anxieties in this quarter are all concentrated in the question. What does the holy alliance, in and out of Congress, mean to do with us on the Missouri question? And this by the way, is but the name of the case; it is only the John Doe, or Richard Roe of the 'jectment.' The real question, as seen in the States afflicted with this unfortunate population is, are our slaves to be presented with freedom and a dagger? For if Congress has the power to regulate the conditions of the inhabitants of the States within the States, it will be but another exercise of that power to declare that all shall be free. Are we, then, to see again Athenian and Lacedæmonian confederacies? To wage another Peloponnesian war to settle the ascendancy between them? Or is this the tocsin of merely a servile war? **THAT REMAINS TO BE SEEN; BUT I HOPE NOT BY YOU OR ME. SURELY THEY WILL PARLEY AWHILE AND GIVE US TIME TO GET OUT OF THE WAY.** What a bedlamite is man!"

In a letter to Lafayette, dated November 4, 1823, Mr. Jefferson said:

"On the eclipse of federalism with us, although not its extinction, its leaders got up the Missouri question, under the false front of lessening the measure of slavery, but with the real view of producing a geographical division of parties, which might ensure them the next President. The people of the North went blindfold into the snare, and followed their leaders for a while with a zeal truly moral and laudable, until they became sensible that they were injuring instead of aiding the real interests of the slaves; that they had been used merely as tools for electioneering purposes, and that trick of hypocrisy then fell as quickly as it had been got up."

In a letter to Mr. Short, dated April 15, 1820, Mr. Jefferson says:

"Although I had laid down as a law to myself never to write, talk, or even think of politics, to know nothing of public affairs, and had therefore ceased to read news papers, yet the Missouri question aroused and filled me with alarm. The old schism of federal and republican threatened nothing, because it existed in every State, and united them together by the fraternity of party. But the coincidence of a marked principle, moral and political, with a geographical line, once conceived, I feared would never more be obliterated from the mind; that it would be recurring on every occasion, and renewing irritations, until it would kindle such mutual and mortal hatred as to render separation preferable to eternal discord. I have been among the most sanguine in believing that our Union would be of long duration. I now doubt it much, and see the event at no great distance, and the direct consequence of this question; not by the line which has been so confidently counted on—the laws of nature control this—but by the Potomac, Ohio, and Missouri, or more probably the Mississippi, upwards to our northern boundary. My only comfort and consolation is, that I shall not live to see it; and I envy not the present generation the glory of throwing away the fruits of their father's sacrifices of life and fortune, and of rendering desperate the experiment which was to decide ultimately whether man is capable of self-government. This treason against human hope will signalize their epoch in future history as the counterpart of the model of their predecessors."

Let the Black Republicans, while quoting Mr. Jefferson, if they have a spark of political honesty, read the foregoing extracts from his writings to their deluded followers.

Allow me now, Mr. President, to refer to the testimony of a man, whose word with the opposition, would once have "stood against the world." I refer to General Harrison. In a letter to President Monroe, he says:

"I am, and have been, for many years, so much opposed to slavery, that I will never live in a State where it exists. But I believe that the Constitution has given no power to the General Government to interfere in this matter, and that to have slaves or no slaves, depends upon the people in each State or territory alone."

"But beside the constitutional objections, I am persuaded that the obvious tendency of such interferences on the part of the States which have no slaves with the property of their fellow-citizens of the others, is to produce a state of discord and jealousy that will in the end prove fatal to the Union. I believe in no other State are such wild and dangerous sentiments entertained on this subject as in Ohio."

When in May, 1854, President Pierce sent to Congress his Black Warrior Message, Giddings of our State took the occasion to let off a "*Jeremiad on the miseries of slavery*." "I look forward," said Mr. Giddings "to the day when I shall see a servile insurrection at the South. When the black man supplied with British bayonets and commanded by British officers, shall wage a war of extermination against the whites—when the master shall see his dwelling in flames, and his hearth-stone polluted, and though I may not mock at their calamity, and laugh when their fear cometh; yet I shall hail it as the dawn of a political millenium."

Well might Mr. Jefferson exclaim, "*what a bedlamite is man!*" And well might General Harrison say, that "*in no State are such wild and dangerous sentiments entertained on this subject as in Ohio.*"

Mr. President, I might multiply extract upon extract from the writings and sayings of these fathers of American liberty, all foreshadowing the downfall of our government, if Black Republicanism triumphs, and the Democracy be overthrown. But I forbear. If you will not listen to such warnings as I have already quoted, "you would not believe though one should rise from the dead."

I ask these fusionists to pause in their mad career and ask themselves, what they expect to gain by breaking down the Constitution and destroying the Union? To use a figurative expression of speech, do they expect that when they have destroyed the Temple they can rebuild it again? Sir, the world never saw such a government as ours before; and if we destroy it, they never will see such an one again. The wisdom of all past ages was unequal to it. It would seem as though that Providence that guided the Pilgrim fathers—that watched over the infant Colonies—that delivered us from the tyranny of the mother country, raised up for that special purpose the men who made our Constitution, and moulded and shaped our form of government. They were self-denying men—men overflowing with patriotism—men with large understanding, and enlarged views, who sought to secure in the Constitution the supreme good of the whole country, and not of this or that particular locality.

Shall we lightly throw away this boon, which would seem to have been the gift of Heaven? Sir, if you destroy this Constitution, "you ne'er shall look upon 'its like again." Once more I call upon our fusion friends to pause in their mad career, and contemplate the abyss that yawns before them. We are now the model government of the world. The hopes of the down-trodden and oppressed of all nations rest upon us. Whilst our government continues, the Tyrants of the Old World tremble upon their thrones. Queen Victoria and Louis Napoleon would give more to see Black Republicanism triumph in this country, than they would for the capture of Sebastapol. Destroy this government, and you put out the light of the world.

My God, Mr. President, is it possible that we have men in our very midst, who have become so mad with prejudice, that they can denounce the Union and deride the Constitution? declare as did one the other day, that "he cared as little for the Union as any southern man dare to!"



Not care for the Union! under it we have grown from three millions to twenty-five millions of freemen. Not care for the Union! under it we have extended our borders to the Gulf of Mexico, and the shores of the Pacific. Not care for the Union! under it our sails whiten every sea, and our commerce reaches the remotest corners of the Globe. Not care for the Union! under it we have gained the respect, and become the admiration of the World. Not care for the Union! under it we have raised the "fairest fabric of human government that ever rose to animate the hopes of civilized man." Dead be the heart, and palsied the tongue that could conceive, and give utterance to such treasonable sentiments.

Sir, upon the 4th of July, the day we celebrate by the ringing of bells, and the firing of cannon, the Lloyd Garrison's, the Theodore Parker's, and other Black Republican leaders in New England, could build a bonfire and burn in derision the Constitution of the United States. They hate the Constitution, and seek by every argument, every pretext to destroy it.

My fellow-citizens, do you desire any further proof of this assertion? You shall have it. At a Black Republican meeting lately held in Boston, the following resolutions, among others, were adopted:

15. *Resolved*, That a constitution which provides for a slave representation and a slave oligarchy in Congress, which legalizes slave hunting and slave catching on every inch of American soil, and which pledges the military and naval power of the country to keep four millions of chattel slaves in their chains, is to be trodden under foot and pronounced accursed, however unexceptionable or valuable may be its other provisions.

16. *Resolved*, That the one great issue before the country is, the dissolution of the Union; in comparison with which all other issues with the slave power are as dust in the balance; therefore, we will give ourselves to the work of annulling this "covenant with death," as essential to our own innocence, and the speedy and everlasting overthrow of the slave system.

Let us, Mr. President, suppose that the Black Republicans succeed in breaking down and destroying this sacred instrument—do they suppose for a single moment that another can be formed? No, sir, no; destroy this, and you must be without a national government. You could never agree upon a new constitution; the one we have would seem to have been the gift of Heaven. It would seem as though a Divine Providence reared up and endowed the men who made it for that special purpose. They had been trained in the school of the Revolution. They were men devoid of selfishness, passion and prejudice. Every day serves but to develop their superior wisdom and foresight. No matter how extended may become our country, or how diversified our local interest if we adhere to a strict construction of the Constitution, and leave these local interests to be taken care of by those who are to be effected by them; that is, leave the people of each State and Territory "perfectly free to form and regulate their local institutions in their own way," all will move on in harmony.

Such is the sacred instrument which Black Republicanism seeks to destroy. And for what, Mr. President? Simply, that they may deprive the people of a territory of their inherent God-given right, to "form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States," lest by a bare possibility, a slave may be removed from one locality to another. There are some among them, I trust, who, in the language of Mr. Jefferson, "*Will dispassionately weigh the blessings they are about to throw away against an abstract question, more likely to be affected by union than by scission;*" then "*they would pause before they would perpetrate this act of suicide upon themselves, and of treason against the hopes of the world.*"

But after all, Mr. President, the salvation of the Constitution rests with the Democracy of the country. We shall be aided by thousands of national men, who heretofore have belonged to other political organizations. Old issues will be discarded, and they will unite with us in battling for the Constitution and the Union.

Against us will be marshaled the combined forces of Black Republicanism, Know-Nothingism, and all the other "isms" of the day. Are we ready for the conflicts? Can we, as did our Revolutionary fathers, if it becomes necessary, go forth to the conflicts with our lives in our hands, to do or die for the great cause of constitutional liberty? Every man among you has an influence. That influence, be it what it may, should be exerted for the Constitution and the Union. Your Revolutionary fathers, to secure that constitutional liberty which we now enjoy, spilt their blood, poured out their treasures, and give up their lives upon the battle-fields of the Revolution. Dying, they bequeathed it to us, to guard it, and cherish it, and to hand it down, unimpaired and uncontaminated, as we received it, to our children, and our children's children. Shall we prove recreant to the trust, and suffer this rich boon to be wrested from our grasp? If so, we shall find that Esau like, we have sold our birthright for less than a mess of pottage.

Upon you, ye aged fathers, you who stood with Jefferson and Jackson, in other days, upon you I call for one more effort before you leave the stage of action. Go to these mad fanatics, and let your gray hairs, and your trembling limbs, plead for the Constitution and the Union.

Upon you also, ye middle aged men, I call. Your fathers pledged to each other "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor," in the great cause of human liberty, and religious toleration. They are gone; but their mantles, I trust, have fallen upon you. Methinks I hear their voice, coming from the spirit-land calling upon you, to pledge to each other "your fortunes, your lives, and your sacred honor," in the defence of the Constitution and the Union.

Upon you also, ye young men, I call. You are just entering upon the threshold of political life. Beware how you connect yourselves with those organizations, which are fighting against the Constitution and the Union. Ultimately they must go down loaded with the execration of every lover of his country. Their pathway to infamy may be marked with "desolated fields—conflagrated cities, and murdered inhabitants," but still they must go down. To have been once numbered in such a party, will load you with infamy for life. Many a young man has been marked and doomed because his father was once in Hartford Convention. Be warned in time; let not the blush of shame mantle the cheeks of your children, because at some future day, the records of the past, shall disclose your names connected with Know-Nothing and Black Republican organizations. Make up your minds at once to cast your lot with that party which has already made your country what it is—that party which always has been, and always will be found battling for the Constitution and the Union.

One and all, let us prepare for the conflict. Let the memory of the past—the hopes of the future—our veneration for the dead, and our love for the living, nerve us for the conflict. And if we fall, the flag of the Union will be our winding sheet, and the Constitution of our country will pillow our coffins. "Hope springs eternal in the human breast," and when I look upon the past, I am cheered for the future. The Democracy have been equal to every emergency, and I doubt not, they will be equal to the coming conflict. Already are they organizing for the canvass. Their battle cry is still "the Constitution and the Union." From the North, the South, the East, and the West, they come. Over them all still waves the flag of the Union.

In such a cause, with such an army, with the prayers and the hopes of the down-trodden and oppressed of all the world, there is no such word as "fail." Victory must perch upon our banner—the black ensign of abolitionism must fall before us—the proscriptive and intolerant banner of Know-Nothingism must trail in the dust. Then millions of hearts in the North and the South, the East and the West, will respond with joyful acclamation to the living sentiment inscribed upon the Flag of our country, by the hand of our Revolutionary Fathers, "E PLURIBUS UNUM."



